



TWELFTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Committee on Sectoral and Technical Meetings and Related Issues

1. The Committee on Sectoral and Technical Meetings and Related Issues met on 7 November 2005.
2. The representative of the Government of the Czech Republic, speaking on behalf of the Government group, proposed Mr. L. Héthy (Hungary) as Chairperson. The Committee agreed unanimously.
3. The Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons were Mr. G. Trogen and Mr. J. Zellhoefer, respectively.
4. Ms. Paxton, Executive Director of the Social Dialogue Sector, informed the Committee of recent administrative changes to the Social Dialogue Sector. The Director-General had taken the decision to regroup the Sectoral Activities Department and the Social Dialogue, Labour Law and Labour Administration Department under a single management. Ms. J. Walgrave would direct the new Department, assisted by two Deputy Directors (Mr. N. Jennings for Sectoral Activities and Mr. G. Casale for Social Dialogue, Labour Law and Labour Administration). As this was Mr. Jennings' last Governing Body she thanked him for his work and long service to the Office, which had been done with a great deal of professionalism, dedication and expertise.
5. Mr. Zellhoefer welcomed the new Chairperson and the new Employer Vice-Chairperson, expressed his appreciation for Mr. Jennings' long-standing work for this Organization and wished him a long, healthy and happy retirement.
6. Mr. Trogen welcomed the Chairperson and said that he was looking forward to working with the Worker Vice-Chairperson. He thanked Mr. Jennings for his cooperation and wished him the best for the future.

I. Purpose, duration and composition of sectoral meetings to be held in 2006-07

7. The Committee had before it a paper¹ on this item.

¹ GB.294/STM/1.

8. Mr. Zellhoefer said that there were some unresolved issues concerning the ICEM that needed attention; however for this meeting the Workers' group agreed with the point for decision. He reiterated the importance of consultations with the groups when selecting an outside chairperson and wondered why so few Latin American countries were on the reserve list in the light of their coal industry and its national importance.
9. Mr. Trogen agreed with the point for decision but questioned the need for an outside chairperson on the grounds of cost and the level of expertise among the Government experts. He noted that the date of the proposed Meeting of Experts for the Chemical Industry had been moved to the week of 15 October 2007 at the request of the social partners.
10. The representative of the Government of the United Kingdom felt that the meetings should be shorter than the planned six days. It was very difficult for Government experts to be detached for such long periods.
11. The representative of the Government of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, approved the point for decision and welcomed the proposal to hold this meeting of experts. He looked forward to the Office's help in using the new code of practice to promote the ratification and implementation of Convention No. 176 throughout Africa. Interested governments should be able to participate as observers in the meeting.
12. The representative of the Government of Nigeria supported each of the foregoing points.
13. Mr. Zellhoefer also looked forward to Convention No. 176 being more widely ratified and implemented with the assistance of a new code of practice.
14. In answering a number of questions, Mr. Jennings, Deputy Director of the Social Dialogue, Labour Law, Labour Administration and Sectoral Activities Department, said that, since the code of practice dealt with safety and health in underground coal mines, the countries that had been suggested were the major underground coal producers. Having a chairperson from outside the meeting had proved to be very effective, including during three meetings of experts early in 2005. It was not expensive and had enabled each of the Government experts to play a full role as experts rather than having to take a certain distance from the discussions by being the chairperson. The Office was aware of the importance of keeping the length of meetings to a practical minimum. Six days (Monday to Saturday) were believed to be necessary in the light of the comprehensiveness of the document and the extent of the revisions to the existing code.
15. *The Committee on Sectoral and Technical Meetings and Related Issues recommends to the Governing Body that:*
 - (a) *the purpose of the Meeting of Experts on Coal Mine Safety be to consider and review a draft and adopt a code of practice on safety and health in coal mines and that the Meeting last six calendar days;*
 - (b) *after consultation with the Employers' and Workers' groups of the Governing Body, a person from outside the Meeting be appointed to chair it;*
 - (c) *the Governments of Australia, China, Germany, India, Poland, Russian Federation, South Africa and the United States be invited to nominate experts to participate in the Meeting in their personal capacity, and that the Governments of Colombia, Romania, Ukraine, United Kingdom and*

Viet Nam be placed on a reserve list to nominate an expert, if any of the abovementioned governments declines to do so;

- (d) eight experts be nominated after consultation with the Employers' group and eight after consultation with the Workers' group of the Governing Body; and*
- (e) experts from other member States may take part as observers, if they wish.*

II. Report on the progress in sectoral action programmes and recommendations for continuation in 2006-07

16. The Committee had before it two papers² on this item.
17. Ms. Walgrave, Director of the Social Dialogue, Labour Law, Labour Administration and Sectoral Activities Department, introduced GB.294/STM/2. Its late submission had resulted from the need to hold a Second Sitting of the Global Steering Group on 28 October 2005. Summarizing the outcome of the meeting, she introduced the points proposed for discussion and endorsement by the Committee, namely: (a) the selection of countries for the three new action programmes in health services; telecommunication services; and public services, as set out in GB.294/STM/2; (b) the continuation of current action programmes in agriculture; construction; education; hotels, catering, and tourism; and textiles and clothing, as well as the cross-sectoral action programme on HIV/AIDS; and (c) the evaluation framework and procedure. Although the Global Steering Group had accepted the suggested evaluation framework and procedure, it had discussed whether the indicators were too timid or too bold, requested the inclusion of more qualitative indicators, and asked the Office to use the expertise of the ILO Evaluation Unit.
18. Mr. Trogen noted that the Global Steering Group had been given the mandate to decide on the matters mentioned and that the STM Committee was invited to endorse the decisions. His group had been well informed by its secretary and endorsed the decisions. He nevertheless regretted that no document had been made available in time for due examination. The Employers were also satisfied that enough money had been found so that no sector needed to be eliminated from the list of action programmes to continue in 2006-07. He asked for clarification on the origin of these funds. In his opinion, the indicators for evaluation were an excellent and ambitious initiative and he welcomed them.
19. Mr. Zellhoefer supported the three new action programmes. He stressed the importance of the programme on the international migration of health service workers. Labour migration in this sector resulted in a serious brain drain and left behind weakened health services in developing countries. Following the meeting of the Global Steering Group, his group had realized that the nine countries selected by the Group should be reduced to seven in order to ensure the proper involvement of Public Services International (PSI) which, at the same time, would be occupied with the action programme on the public service. The seven countries to be invited to take part should be Bangladesh, Costa Rica, India, Kenya, Romania, Senegal and Trinidad and Tobago. Barbados, Mexico, the Republic of Moldova, Morocco and Sri Lanka should be put on the reserve list. He supported the continuation of the current action programmes selected and urged the Office to secure additional funds for this purpose from donors, field offices and other ILO technical units. The Workers' group

² GB.294/STM/2; GB.294/STM/2/Inf.

supported the proposed evaluation framework and invited the Office to identify more qualitative criteria for a number of action programmes and to link these to the action programmes' objectives. Gender-specific indicators were also needed, as many of the sectors concerned had a considerable female labour force. He appreciated the work of the Global Steering Group as it contributed to one of the purposes behind the creation of action programmes, namely the transparent involvement of ILO constituents in sectoral activities.

- 20.** The representative of the Government of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, commended the work of the Steering Group. The timely cooperation with the WHO and the IOM in the health sector was a first step towards policy coherence in addressing the challenges of labour migration. Kenya was pleased to take part in the health sector action programme as it had recently experienced an exodus of health professionals. This had led to serious understaffing in public health institutions and to a check on the advances in combating preventable diseases that were endemic in Africa. Most health systems in sub-Saharan Africa had almost collapsed. The Africa region hoped that this action programme would lead to strategies and practices to ensure that the benefits from migration were fairly shared between sending and receiving countries.
- 21.** The Government representative of El Salvador thanked the Office and the Steering Group for the document, and pointed out that although El Salvador was listed in footnote 3 as a reserve country for participation in the health service sector action programme, it was not clear to him whether the Steering Group had concluded the relevant consultations with the constituents, and he was therefore unable to state definitely that his Government was interested in the programme. Moreover, in the light of the changes to the list sought by the Worker representative, it appeared that the most sensible course would be to remove footnote 3 from document GB.294/STM/2, until the relevant consultations had been concluded, thereby providing the opportunity and flexibility needed to draw up the final list on the basis of those consultations.
- 22.** The representative of the Government of Mexico shared this concern and supported the deletion of footnote 3. She highlighted the importance of prior consultations between the constituents and the regional offices, to gain an understanding of the opinions and priorities of the countries participating in the action programmes.
- 23.** The representative of the Government of Germany, speaking on behalf of IMEC, regretted the document's late submission. She welcomed the transparent and formalized approach for selecting candidate countries; the criteria met their sectoral needs. IMEC welcomed cooperation with the WHO and the IOM on the action programme in the health services sector and hoped that this action programme would demonstrate that more could be accomplished through collaboration. IMEC commended the Office for developing criteria to decide on the continuation of action programmes. These met the requirements put forward by IMEC countries at the Committee's last session in March 2005. They were also linked to the ILO's strategic objectives and decent work country programmes. Considering the existence of functioning national steering groups as one of the criteria would enable improvements in the sectors brought about by those bodies to be measured. She urged the Office to use the funds earmarked for the continuation of action programmes in an economical and flexible way. The speaker welcomed the evaluation framework and indicators and the distinction between universal and sector-specific indicators. Universal indicators could go beyond quantitative measuring. The Office should also consider finding ways to use the experiences gained for the benefit of other countries. To this effect, a framework to transmit lessons learned should be developed. Information on the self-evaluation questionnaire should be submitted to the next session of the Committee. The Office was well on the way to increasing the influence, visibility and impact of sectoral activities. She encouraged the Office to continue in this direction and to find the means to further develop sectoral activities.

24. A representative of the Government of Japan endorsed the statement made on behalf of IMEC, regretted the late submission of the background document and welcomed the improvements to the procedures adopted, in particular regarding the criteria for country selection. Sectoral meetings would be a good way to follow up on the new action programmes, enabling the results to be shared by all constituents.
25. The representative of the Government of Nigeria associated herself with the statement made on behalf of the Africa group. She noted that her country was on the list for the preliminary activity of the programme on telecommunication services, but regretted that it had not been selected for the programme on health services. Moreover, in view of the problems in the public service, it was also regrettable that her country had not been selected to take part in the action programme on the public service.
26. Ms. Walgrave thanked the Committee for its confidence in the Department with regard to the action programmes. She explained that the Global Steering Group had adopted the list of participating countries after the Office's proposals had been discussed extensively during a prior briefing meeting for the government regional coordinators. Consultations would continue to ensure that full support of governments and social partners would be secured in all participating countries. The list reflected these discussions and was flexible. When making these choices, the Office and the Global Steering Group had been mindful of the mandate given by the Governing Body not to work in too many countries. She said she understood the limitation on participating countries requested by PSI, as tripartite participation was essential.
27. In view of the comments, Mr. Zellhoefer concluded that the list of countries should be considered tentative and required further consultation at all levels.
28. The Committee took note of the Steering Group's recommendations and endorsed them.

III. Report of the Sixth Session of the Joint IMO/ILO Ad Hoc Expert Working Group on Liability and Compensation regarding Claims for Death, Personal Injury and Abandonment of Seafarers (19-21 September 2005)

29. Ms. Paxton summarized the work of the Sixth Session of the IMO/ILO Joint Working Group. It had decided that the situation regarding the abandonment of seafarers was not satisfactory and that work should proceed towards a mandatory solution, subject to the outcome of the International Labour Conference (Maritime Session) in February 2006. It had also established procedures of operation of the database on reported cases of abandonment. Since it had decided to include fishing vessels on international voyages in the remit of a longer-term solution, it had been suggested that a fishing vessel owner be included of the ILO delegation.
30. Mr. Zellhoefer expressed his group's full support of the work of the Joint Working Group and looked forward to the next stages. The session had demonstrated the benefits of good inter-agency cooperation.
31. A representative of the International Shipping Federation (ISF) reiterated that there was no need for a mandatory solution. Concerning the suggestion to modify the composition of the Joint Working Group by incorporating a fishing vessel owner representative, she referred to a communication from the ISF to the ILO that had suggested that separate meetings

should be held covering fishing vessels only, if this was considered necessary. Regarding the database, adequate resources should be made available to update and operate it, in particular since the Department's maritime team had other urgent tasks. Since the International Labour Conference (Maritime Session) would probably render the holding of a seventh session of the Joint Working Group unnecessary, her group reserved its position on this issue.

32. Mr. Zellhoefer responded that a representative of the International Transport Workers' Federation (ITF) might attend future sessions of the Committee.
33. The Committee took note of the information provided.

IV. Report of the 19th Ordinary Session of the Intergovernmental Committee on the International Convention for the Protection of Performers, Producers of Phonograms and Broadcasting Organizations (Rome Convention, 1961) (Paris, 27-28 June 2005)

34. The Committee had before it a paper³ on this item.
35. Ms. Paxton pointed out that the Intergovernmental Committee's session had been fairly uneventful, as there had been little change in the field of intellectual property rights in performing arts since 2001. The most important development in this domain had occurred in October 2005, when the General Conference of UNESCO had adopted the Convention on the protection and promotion of the diversity of cultural expressions. That Convention sought to reaffirm the links between culture, development and dialogue and to create an innovative platform for international cultural cooperation, while ensuring that measures aimed at protecting and promoting the diversity of cultural expressions did not hinder respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, such as freedom of expression, information and communication. The next session of the Intergovernmental Committee of the Rome Convention was due to be held in 2009; by that time, however, it was expected that a new WIPO Convention on broadcasting, and possibly another on audiovisual performances, would be adopted.
36. Mr. Trogen took note of the report.
37. Mr. Zellhoefer acknowledged the report and expressed appreciation for the Office's joint activities with UNESCO and WIPO in the domain of intellectual property rights. He regretted that the negotiations on an international instrument on audiovisual performances under the aegis of WIPO had made no progress since 2000. Such an instrument would have been of particular relevance for musicians in order to protect their rights. He also regretted that the question of a possible update of the Rome Convention had not been addressed at the 19th Session of the Intergovernmental Committee. In view of the delays in reaching a consensus on the international instrument on audiovisual performances in WIPO, it would be advisable to initiate discussions on a revision of the Rome Convention, within the Intergovernmental Committee. In relation to the proposed WIPO international instrument on broadcasting, his group considered that the protection of broadcasting organizations should be limited to the protection against unauthorized reproduction of

³ GB.294/STM/4.

signals. Performers' property rights constituted a source of their income, and should therefore be safeguarded.

38. The Committee took note of the information provided.

V. Tripartite Meeting on Promoting Fair Globalization in Textiles and Clothing in a Post-MFA Environment (24-26 October 2005)

39. Mr. J.-J. Elmiger, Chairperson of the Meeting, provided an oral presentation in advance of a full discussion at the next session of the Committee. The discussions had been open, direct and straightforward. The context of the Meeting was marked, on the one hand, by considerable uncertainty on the future of the textiles and clothing (TC) industry worldwide and, on the other, by the agreement reached between the European Union and China and the ongoing negotiations between the United States and China, following the implementation of safeguard measures by the United States. Participants had asked for the implementation and the full respect of trade rules applicable to the TC industry so as to guarantee fair and open competition. They had also called for respect for and implementation of core labour standards, in order to prevent some actors from gaining market share to the detriment of fundamental human social rights. Despite States' very different situations, a consensus on a large number of issues had been reached. This consensus, together with reservations expressed by some participants on specific topics, was reflected in the Chairperson's summary and in the forthcoming report of the Meeting. The outcome of the Meeting was very encouraging, as several priority areas had been identified. For the ILO, four major priorities had been identified: (a) supporting a major drive to improve skills development for both workers and managers in the sector; (b) providing a new global information and analysis service, including better and more up-to-date employment information and details of compliance with core international labour standards; (c) providing assistance in compliance and remediation to requesting exporting countries ready to ratify and implement core labour standards; and (d) establishing a global social responsibility forum for dialogue between governments and employers' and workers' organizations in the producing and buying links in the TC chain, relevant international agencies and other relevant bodies. Strategies should provide a positive and mutually reinforcing environment for the industry while ensuring respect for workers' rights, social dialogue and labour relations, competitiveness and productivity. The Meeting had also called on developed countries to support initiatives for compliance with international labour standards and to provide technical assistance to developing countries, within a multipartite framework, to facilitate the implementation of socially responsible labour restructuring programmes. Moreover, it had urged developing countries to adopt strategies that combined the pursuit of improved competitiveness with the promotion of decent work and, more particularly, the creation of national tripartite bodies to monitor the social and economic dimensions of the end of quotas. It had also called on least developed countries to develop training and retraining programmes to improve skills and employability. The Meeting had recognized the need to promote a responsible supply chain based on partnerships that would balance social and commercial interests during the transition period. Lastly, the ILO was requested to cooperate more actively with the World Bank, the WTO and multi-stakeholder initiatives, such as the MFA Forum.

40. Mr. Trogen said that the Meeting had been very positive, and had developed a very constructive set of guidelines on action to be taken. It was particularly important to consider competitiveness in the strategies to be developed. He reiterated the reservations of

his group regarding the promotion of policy coherence between the ILO, the WTO, the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and other international institutions.

41. Mr. Zellhoefer recalled that it was the Workers' group that had pressed for a long time for the holding of this Meeting. His group supported the Chairperson's summary and asked the ILO to mobilize resources to ensure proper follow-up. He regretted that certain passages, including a reference to the Tripartite Declaration of Principles concerning Multinational Enterprises and Social Policy, had not found unanimous support. The next three years of breathing space should be used for reviewing and developing trade, industrial and social policies for the sector to enhance productivity, quality and adherence to labour standards with a view to stabilization and growth of the industry nationally and globally. The ILO should play a leading role in this process, also by further cooperation by the WTO. His group supported the International Textile, Garment and Leather Workers' Federation's call for the WTO to provide for a specific discussion on trade liberalization in the TC sector during its forthcoming Ministerial Conference in Hong Kong, China, in December.
42. A Worker member from Egypt referred to the collapse of the TC sector in many developing countries following the trade liberalization process and its negative consequences on employment, wages and the protection of workers. These developments had hit young women particularly hard. Every effort should be taken to stop social dumping and address the grave crisis.
43. A Worker member from Brazil highlighted the problems encountered by all Latin American workers, particularly women workers, as a result of the end of the quota system. The current crisis increased poverty and discrimination against women. Governments had to establish safeguards measures to protect their TC workers from the disastrous consequences encountered.
44. A representative of the Government of China said that China had also implemented very difficult structural adjustments to improve the competitiveness of its TC sector. It should not be criticized for its economic success now that the quotas, which had distorted the market, had been lifted.
45. A representative of the Government of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, indicated that many African countries, that had benefited from the quota system and from the African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA), were now in a transition period during which they had to adapt and improve their competitiveness. The ILO should provide adequate assistance to improve skills development and employability. The experience acquired in Cambodia, South Africa and Morocco should be used to develop and implement appropriate strategies in sub-Saharan countries, including Kenya.
46. A representative of the Government of the United States expressed his appreciation of the ILO for having dealt efficiently with this difficult issue. The Office should continue promoting best practices in this sector for the benefit of governments and employers' and workers' organizations.

VI. Report of the International Symposium on the Role of Trade Unions in the Global Economy and the Fight against Poverty (17-21 October 2005)

47. The Committee had before it a paper⁴ on this item.
48. Mr. Zellhoefer considered that the meeting was timely in light of the gravity of the problem addressed. Almost half of the world's total workforce, and nearly 60 per cent of the workers in developing countries, were not earning enough to lift themselves and their families above the US\$2 a day poverty line. This demonstrated that the global economy was working only for a few and needed a social pillar, coherence and better governance. He stressed the central message contained in paragraph 9 of the document that the trade unions have always been the principal means for working people to have representation, escape poverty and attain social justice for themselves and their communities, and freedom of association is paramount, and encouraged Employer and Government representatives to read the conclusions.
49. Mr. Trogen took note.
50. An Employer member from India was particularly disturbed by the fact that the message contained in paragraph 9 of the document did not relate to the title of the Symposium. Unions had important roles to play, in particular in fields such as skills development and productivity; this was not reflected in the document. In developing countries in particular, the role of unions should not be underestimated, since they could make real contributions to development. The conclusions did not seem to cover these aspects, and he suggested that follow-up in the form of an action programme or another symposium should be considered to enable the relevant groups to work together.
51. The representative of the Government of Nigeria referred to paragraph 7 of the document and called on the international financial institutions to put more emphasis on employment rather than on purely economic issues. She urged employers and governments to engage in social dialogue; trade unions were not the only way to move workers out of poverty. Her country had benefited from social dialogue and therefore promoted it.
52. Mr. Zellhoefer pointed out that the paper before the Committee did not reflect all the conclusions. A number of paragraphs of the conclusions referred specifically to the role of trade unions. Given the interest in the Symposium, the conclusions should be made widely available.
53. The Committee took note of the information provided.

⁴ GB.294/STM/6.

VII. Other questions

(a) **Proposals for the convening of the Subcommittee on Wages of Seafarers of the Joint Maritime Commission**
(Geneva, 24-25 February 2006)

54. The Committee had before it a paper⁵ on this item.
55. Ms. Paxton introduced the document and pointed out that paragraph 5 proposed that the Subcommittee on Wages of Seafarers of the Joint Maritime Commission be convened at ILO headquarters in Geneva from 24 to 25 February 2006. Its work would begin after the closure of the Maritime Conference and would continue, if necessary, until 25 February 2006. There would be no cost to the Office. The agenda of the Subcommittee would consist of a single item: The Seafarers' Wages, Hours of Work and the Manning of Ships Recommendation, 1996 (No. 187): the updating of the basic wage of able seamen. The report of the Subcommittee would be submitted directly to the Governing Body.
56. Mr. Trogen supported the point for decision in paragraph 6.
57. Mr. Zellhoefer agreed with Mr. Trogen, but regretted that this meeting could not have been held earlier in order to maintain the two-year periodicity as set out in the resolution concerning the ILO minimum wage for able seamen adopted by the Subcommittee in July 2003. He also suggested the use of the word "seafarer" instead of "seaman".
58. *The Committee on Sectoral and Technical Meetings and Related Issues recommends to the Governing Body that it approve the convening of the Subcommittee on Wages of Seafarers of the Joint Maritime Commission in the conditions described in paragraph 5 of GB.294/STM/7/1.*

(b) **Revision of the *International Medical Guide for Ships***

59. The Committee had before it a paper⁶ on this item.
60. Ms. Paxton introduced the document concerning the revision of the ILO/IMO/WHO *International Medical Guide for Ships*, the first edition of which had been published by the WHO in 1967. The WHO intended to hold a meeting during the first half of 2006 to permit experts to review the final draft of the Guide. ILO participation would be at no cost to the Office. The revised third edition would then be submitted to the ILO Governing Body for approval by the end of 2006.
61. Mr. Zellhoefer supported this work, noting the wide use of the Guide and the importance of keeping it up to date to reflect changes in medical treatment.
62. A representative of the International Shipping Federation welcomed the revision of the Guide in the light of the need to address such new diseases as avian flu, SARS and

⁵ GB.294/STM/7/1.

⁶ GB.294/STM/7/2.

Norwalk virus. However, her group was concerned that the tendency to hold meetings at no cost to the Office had a negative impact on a fair global representation.

63. The representative of the Government of Nigeria hoped that all medical concerns would be addressed, including health problems endemic to the African region. She was pleased that the WHO was involved, and expected that the revised version of the Guide would be extremely useful.
64. Mr. Zellhoefer, referring to the comment concerning the holding of meetings at no cost to the Office, pointed out that, as the document indicated, the International Transport Workers' Federation (ITF) had funded some of the preparatory work.
65. The Committee took note of the information provided.

(c) Joint ILO/UNESCO Committee of Experts on the Application of the Recommendations concerning Teaching Personnel (CEART): Interim report on allegations submitted by teachers' organizations

66. The Committee had before it an information document prepared by the Office⁷ on the interim report of the Joint ILO/UNESCO Committee of Experts on the Application of the Recommendations concerning Teaching Personnel (CEART) concerning allegations submitted by the All Japan Teachers and Staff Union (ZENKYO) on the non-observance in Japan of certain provisions of the ILO/UNESCO Recommendation concerning the Status of Teachers, 1966.
67. Ms. Paxton noted that the document dealt with the continuation of a previous case before the CEART; it was an interim report prepared between regular three-year sessions, and submitted to the Committee for information. The main document for decision was before the Committee on Legal Issues and International Labour Standards (LILS) at the present session of the Governing Body.
68. Mr. Trogen stated that the Employers' group took note of the information document. They wondered whether there was a need for such a committee of experts uniquely for teachers, and whether similar bodies existed for other categories of workers.
69. Mr. Zellhoefer considered that there was a need for the CEART, which had a mandate agreed by the Governing Body. He noted the document for information, as well as the examination of a document for decision and the interim report in the LILS Committee.
70. A representative of the Government of Japan said that his Government had several serious concerns in relation to the interim report of the CEART. These would be expressed during the discussion in the LILS Committee.
71. The Committee took note of the information provided.

⁷ GB.294/STM/7/3.

**(d) Tripartite Meeting of Experts on the ILO
Multilateral Framework on Labour Migration
(31 October-2 November 2005)**

- 72.** Mr. Awad, Chief of the International Migration Branch, reported on the Tripartite Meeting of Experts on the ILO Multilateral Framework on Labour Migration. It had examined the draft Multilateral Framework on Labour Migration, alongside comments received from governments and the social partners. While there had been overwhelming support for the draft, a number of concerns had been raised by participants in relation to issues of sovereignty, the prescriptive nature of the instrument, a distinction between regular and non-regular migrants, and the follow-up. Thanks to successful cooperation, all the problems had been solved; a follow-up mechanism had not been included. The final document had been unanimously agreed upon; further remarks had been received and the draft would be submitted to the March session of the Governing Body.
- 73.** Mr. Zellhoefer pointed out that, since this item had just been introduced to the agenda and there was no document, he looked forward to a full discussion at the Committee's next session.
- 74.** Mr. Trogen agreed.
- 75.** The Committee took note of the information provided.

Geneva, 10 November 2005.

Points for decision: Paragraph 15;
Paragraph 58.